



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/561,486	10/18/2006	Robert Linley Muir	17237US01	6424
23446	7590	06/22/2010	EXAMINER	
MCANDREWS HELD & MALLEY, LTD 500 WEST MADISON STREET SUITE 3400 CHICAGO, IL 60661			RENWICK, REGINALD A	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
		3714		
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
06/22/2010	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/561,486	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MUIR ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> REGINALD A. RENWICK	<b>Art Unit</b> 3714

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05/26/2010.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-4, 6-20 and 22-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-4, 6-20, 22-50 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/GS-68)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3 Claims 1, 6-14, 23- 29, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raven (U.S. Patent No. 5,429,361) in further view of Green (U.S. Patent No. 5,954,583).

Re claims 1, 4, 9, 10, 11, 14: Raven discloses a gaming system including a system controller (column 1, lines 50-54, column 2, lines 43-65: wherein the system controller is a MASTERCOM), a plurality of gaming machines (column 1, lines 51-54), a communications system connecting each of the plurality of gaming machine to the

system controller (Fig. 3: wherein wires connect the game machine to the system controller), and a player identification device having an associated player credit (column 7, lines 3-10; column 11, lines 24-40), each of the gaming machines each having (1) a credit recording facility (column 10, lines 59-65), (2) a player input device (Abstract: a player input device is a card reader), (3) a player identification input device responsive to a player identification device (column 7, lines 3-10; column 10, lines 38-64; column 11, lines 24-40: the player identification device is a magnetic card or smart card); and (4) a game controller to play a game when a player has established a credit in the credit recording facility of the selected gaming machine(column 3, lines 12-16; column 10, lines 52-64; column 11, lines 1-13: wherein the game controller is a microprocessor), wherein the credit establishment facility includes a terminal connected to communications system for transfer of player credits via the communication system to a selected gaming machine selected for play of a game (Fig. 3 & column 10 lines 55-64: the main computer is a terminal connected to the communications system that transfers credits to the game machine), said terminal located remotely from the selected gaming machine (Fig. 3: the main computer, object 16, is remotely located from the selected game machine) and arranged to establish a player credit and to associate that credit with a player identification device of the player establishing the credit (column 10 lines 55-64: the main computer sends credit to the gaming device only after the player has inputted their player card with an associated personal identification number), and wherein said player credit is transferred to the gaming machine selected for play (column 10 lines 55-64: the credits are transferred to the game machine) and said

player credit being held in said credit recording facility of the gaming machine selected for play, and wherein the gaming machine is locked so that the one gaming machine no longer operates to play a game by any player (column 8, lines 14-36), solely at a time when player credit held in the credit recording facility of the one gaming machine is non-zero, and automatically unlocked to allow play when a player tracking device is afterward supplied to the tracking input device of another gaming machine, and credit associated with the credit held in the credit recording facility of the one gaming machine is automatically transferred to the credit recording facility of the other gaming machine in response to the player tracking device being supplied to the tracking input device of the other gaming machine.

Raven fails to disclose that the machine is locked solely when player credit held in the credit recording facility of the respective machine is non-zero. Therefore attention must be directed towards Green which states that "if there are no credits left on the machine at the end of player there is no need to insert the key-the machine will automatically be released after predetermined time." Green further states that "a member may reserve a machine, with credits on it, and without having his key actually in the machine," and thus Green provides reserving a game machine solely when player credit is held in the machine. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the invention of Raven with the requirement that a reserved machine have player credits as taught by Green, for the purpose of preventing game machines from becoming unprofitable due to their un-usability while having no player credits stored on them.

Re claim 4: Raven fails to disclose that each gaming machine connected to the system includes a timeout device such that when the machine is locked for more than a predetermined time any credit held in the credit recording facility of the machine is transferred to the system controller and held there for the player and the machine is unlocked to allow another player to establish a credit in the credit recording facility of the machine and to commence play. Therefore attention must be directed towards Green which discloses such (column 12, lines 9-25; column 9, liens 1-3). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the invention of Raven so that credits on a reserved gaming machine are placed in a secure location as taught by Green for the purpose of protecting players from losing their credits.

Re claim 6: Raven discloses with respect to the system as claimed in claim 1 that the player credit established by the credit establishment facility and associated with a player identification device of a player establishing the credit is held in the system controller (column 11, lines 58-61).

Re claim 7: Raven discloses that each gaming machine connected to the system includes a credit importing facility such that when a player identification device is supplied to a gaming machine that is not currently holding a player credit in its credit recording facility and is unlocked, the gaming machine will signal the system controller to transfer the players credit of the player supplying the player identification device to

the credit recording facility of the respective gaming machine (Abstract; column 10, lines 52-64) wherein the credit importing facility is microprocessor which updates the gaming machine display with the received credits.

Re claims 8: Raven discloses that the player credit held in the system controller is transferred to the credit recording facility of the machine selected by the player when the player inserts the associated player identification tracking device into the player identification input device of the selected machine (column 10, lines 47-64).

Re claim 12: Raven discloses that the token is issued by a gaming establishment as an in-house mechanism (column 11, lines 27-28).

Re claim 13: Raven discloses that the token is a financial transaction card issued by a remote financial institution wherein the financial transaction card is a credit card (column 10, lines 44-47, 55-59).

Re claim 46, 47, 48: As stated in claim 1, Raven as modified by Green would be locked solely to be locked/reserved, there must be credits present on the game machine and Raven discloses that credits on the game machine are transferred from the credit establishment facility to the gaming machine (column 10, lines 44-64). Raven further discloses that when locked, no other player can play the game machine and thus play is

prevented when the game machine is supplied with the player identification device of another player.

Re claim 47: Raven detects that the selected game machine is in use prior to the reservation process, simply by detecting that there is a player

4       Claims 2, 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raven in view of Green in further view of Walker (US PG PUB 2003/0220138)

Re claims 2: Raven discloses the actuating of a plurality of buttons to instantiate a reservation of a game machine (column 8, lines 14-39). However, Raven fails to disclose that the gaming machines connected to the system includes a singular reservation button and wherein said player action includes actuation of said reservation button. Therefore attention must be directed towards Walker which discloses a gaming machine similar to that of Raven discloses a reservation button wherein the reservation button is a "freeze button" that when pressed while the player tracking means is present causes the machine to lock and prevent further play in the absence of the respective player tracking means (0227; 0265). Because both Raven and Walker disclose actuating a button or buttons to proceed with a reservation process, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to simply substitute the plural buttons of Raven with the singular button of Walker, for the purpose of making reserving a game machine easier to reserve by limiting the amount of buttons that need to be actuated.

Re claims 3: Under the operation of the combination of Raven and Walker as stated above, the game machine must contain player's credit, because Raven states that when a player's credit is zero the player must replenish their account in order to continue (column 11, lines 37-40).

Re claim 44: Raven discloses that said player action further includes use of said player identification device wherein the player identification device must be placed into the machine before reservation means can progress (column 8, lines 25-30).

Re claim 45: Raven discloses that the player action includes removal of said player identification card from said player identification device (column 8, lines 25-30).

5. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raven in view of Green in further view of Wilder (U.S. Patent 6,638,169).

Re claims 14: Raven fails to disclose that the token is a ticket is a ticket readable by an acceptor mounted within the gaming machine. However, Wilder discloses such (column 4, lines 5-29) containing a plurality of information (column 4, lines 14-15) which one skilled in the art would reasonably assume is player information. Because both Raven and Wilder disclose methods of transferring player information to the gaming machine, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to replace the card means of Raven

for the ticket means of Wilder for the purpose of placing credits onto a medium that is redeemable outside of the casino, for merchandise and for restaurants.

6       Claims 15, 16, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raven in view of Green in further view of Kowalick (U.S. Patent No. 7,107,245).

Re claims 15, 16, and 17: Raven fails to disclose that the player identification input device is a bio-sensor input device and the player identification device is a physical attribute of the player. However, Kowalick discloses that the player identification input device is a bio-sensor containing a biometric sample (Abstract) wherein the biometric sample can include a fingerprint or a eye scanner (column 2, lines 11-15). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the invention of the invention of Raven with a biometric sensor to identify a player's identity for the purpose of providing a player token that can not be fraudulently copied and reproduced.

7.       Claims 18, 22-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raven in view of Walker (US Patent No. 6,634,942).

Re claim 18, 25, 26, 27, : Raven discloses a gaming system including a system controller (column 1, lines 50-54, column 2, lines 43-65) wherein the system controller is a MASTERCOM, a plurality of gaming machines (column 1, lines 51-54), a

communications system connecting each of the plurality of gaming machine to the system controller wherein wires connect the game machine to the system controller (Fig. 3), and a player identification device having an associated player credit (column 7, lines 3-10; column 11, lines 24-40), each of the gaming machines each having (1) a credit recording facility (column 10, lines 59-65), (2) a player input device (Abstract) wherein a player input device is a card reader, (3) a player identification input device responsive to a player identification device (column 7, lines 3-10; column 10, lines 38-64; column 11, lines 24-40) wherein the player identification device is a magnetic card or smart card; and (4) a game controller to play a game when a player has established a credit in the credit recording facility of the respective gaming machine(column 3, lines 12-16; column 10, lines 52-64; column 11, lines 1-13) wherein the game controller is a microprocessor, game machine is locked to prevent play of the gaming machine by any player (column 8, lines 14-36), via player action and unlocked when the machine is supplied via the identification input device (column 8, lines 14-36), with the player identification device associated with the credit held in the credit recording facility of the respective gaming machine(column 8, lines 14-36).

Raven fails to disclose that the machine is locked solely when player credit held in the credit recording facility of the respective machine is non-zero. Therefore attention must be directed towards Green which states that "if there are no credits left on the machine at the end of play there is no need to insert the key-the machine will automatically be released after predetermined time." Green further states that "a member may reserve a

Art Unit: 3714

machine, with credits on it, and without having his key actually in the machine," and thus Green provides reserving a game machine solely when player credit is held in the machine. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the invention of Raven with the requirement that a reserved machine have player credits as taught by Green, for the purpose of preventing game machines from becoming unprofitable due to their un-usability while having no player credits stored on them. Raven in view of Green fails to disclose that the gaming machine is locked so that when a player tracking device is supplied to the tracking input device of another gaming machine, and credit associated with the credit held in the credit recording facility of the one gaming machine is transferred to the credit recording facility of the other gaming machine. Therefore, attention must be directed towards Walker which discloses that a player can play a game machine and then proceed to another game machine and by inserting their card, unlock the previous game machine. In addition the player can receive a credit balance that results in a payout from the previous game machine (column 15, lines 37-57) or even resume play of the previous game (column 16, lines 7-11), which both require the game machine to inherently have a credit recording facility that counts and displays the credit of the game. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the game system of Raven to allow players to reestablish gameplay on another game machine and remove the reservation of a previous game machine as taught by Walker, for the purpose of allowing more players to play more game machines, thus increasing the revenue of the casino.

Re claim 22: Raven discloses that a player credit is established by a credit establishment facility and associated with a player tracking device of a player establishing the credit wherein the credit establishment facility is the casino in control of the system controller, said player credit to be held in the system controller wherein the player tracking device is the player identification card (column 10, lines 44-64).

Re claim 23: Raven discloses that each gaming machine connected to the system includes a credit importing facility such that when a player identification device is supplied to a gaming machine that is not currently holding a player credit in its credit recording facility and is unlocked, the gaming machine will signal the system controller to transfer the players credit of the player supplying the player identification device to the credit recording facility of the respective gaming machine (Abstract; column 10, lines 52-64) wherein the credit importing facility is microprocessor which updates the gaming machine display with the received credits.

Re claims 24: Raven discloses that the player credit held in the system controller is transferred to the credit recording facility of the machine selected by the player when the player inserts the associated player identification tracking device into the player identification input device of the selected machine (column 10, lines 47-64).

Re claim 28: Raven discloses that the token is issued by a gaming establishment as an in-house mechanism (column 11, lines 27-28).

Re claims 29: Raven discloses that the token is a financial transaction card issued by a remote financial institution wherein the financial transaction card is a credit card (column 10, lines 44-47, 55-59).

8. Claims 19, 20, 26, 44, and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raven in view of Green in further view of Walker (US PG PUB 2003/0220138)

Re claim 19: Raven discloses the actuating of a plurality of buttons to instantiate a reservation of a game machine (column 8, lines 14-39). However, Raven fails to disclose that the gaming machines connected to the system includes a singular reservation button and wherein said player action includes actuation of said reservation button. Therefore attention must be directed towards Walker which discloses a gaming machine similar to that of Raven discloses a reservation button wherein the reservation button is a "freeze button" that when pressed while the player tracking means is present causes the machine to lock and prevent further play in the absence of the respective player tracking means (0227; 0265). Because both Raven and Walker disclose actuating a button or buttons to proceed with a reservation process, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to simply substitute the plural buttons of Raven with the singular button of Walker, for the purpose of making reserving a game machine easier to reserve by limiting the amount of buttons that need to be actuated.

Re claims 20: Under the operation of the combination of Raven and Walker as stated above, the game machine must contain player's credit, because Raven states that when a player's credit is zero the player must replenish their account in order to continue (column 11, lines 37-40).

9. Claims 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raven in view of Green in further view of Wilder (U.S. Patent 6,638,169).

Re claim 30: Raven fails to disclose that the token is a ticket is a ticket readable by an acceptor mounted within the gaming machine. However, Wilder discloses such (column 4, lines 5-29) containing a plurality of information (column 4, lines 14-15) which one skilled in the art would reasonably assume is player information. Because both Raven and Wilder disclose methods of transferring player information to the gaming machine, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to replace the card means of Raven for the ticket means of Wilder for the purpose of placing credits onto a medium that is redeemable outside of the casino, for merchandise and for restaurants.

10. Claims 32, 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raven in view of Green in further view of Kowalick (U.S. Patent No. 7,107,245).

Re claims 32, 33: Raven fails to disclose that the player identification input device is a bio-sensor input device and the player identification device is a physical attribute of the player. However, Kowalick discloses that the player identification input device is a bio-sensor containing a biometric sample (Abstract) wherein the biometric sample can include a fingerprint or a eye scanner (column 2, lines 11-15). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the invention of the invention of Raven with a biometric sensor to identify a player's identity for the purpose of providing a player token that can not be fraudulently copied and reproduced.

11. Claim 49 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raven in view of Green, in further view of Dickenson(U.S. Patent No. 5,265,874).

Re claim 49: Raven as modified by Green fails to disclose with respect to the gaming system of claim 1 wherein said terminal is a cashier's terminal operable by a cashier. However, Dickenson discloses that after a player leaves a gaming machine by removing their card from the gaming machine wherein credits are transferred to the central server, players can go to cashier terminal to receive a cash out (column 4, lines 30-42). Raven, like Dickenson discloses that a player can proceed to a cashier to redeem their earnings (column 11, lines 21-23) and therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the game system of Raven with the cashier terminal of Dickenson for the purpose of allowing players to cash out their earnings.

12. Claim 50 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raven in view of Green in further view of Gatto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,916,244).

Re claim 50: Raven as modified by Green fails to disclose that the gaming system of claim 1 wherein said terminal is cash in/cash out terminal operable by the player. However, Gatto discloses an automated cashier terminal in which credits associated with an ID instrument is redeemed (column, lines 17-34 & lines 14-24) and money is dispensed into the ID account (column 4, lines 51-55). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the invention of Raven with the automated cashier terminals of Gatto for the purpose of speeding up service to the players when attempting to cash in and cash out credits.

***Response to Arguments***

13. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4, 6-20, and 22-50 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The Applicant has amended claim 1 to states "includes a terminal connected to the communications system for transfer of player credits via the communication system to a selected gaming machine selected for play of a game, said terminal located remotely from the selected gaming machine and arranged to establish a player credit." However, as stated above Raven discloses said feature whereby the main computer is a terminal connected to the communications system that transfers credits to the game machine.

***Conclusion***

14. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to REGINALD A. RENWICK whose telephone number is (571)270-1913. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 7:30AM-5:00PM, Alt Fridays, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dmitry Suhol can be reached on 571-272-4430. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/R. A. R./  
Examiner, Art Unit 3714

/Pierre E. Elisca/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3714